

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
November 2, 2006**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Robert Hall, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols and David Wobker

STAFF PRESENT: Judd Black, Development Review Manager; Steve Fischer and Gary Lee, Senior Planners; Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:20 PM. Design Review Board members Dennis Cope, Lee Madrid and Mery Velastegui were excused.

MINUTES

September 21, 2006:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 21, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED (2-0-2, WITH MR. HALL AND MR. WOBKER ABSTAINING).

APPROVAL

L060422, Well #3 Rehabilitation

Description: New well house facility to be constructed at existing well site

Location: 9306 Avondale Road

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Applicant: Dennis Brunelle with City of Redmond

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report, noting that the new construction access shown on the site plan had to be eliminated because the City has no paperwork to support that. Staff has recommended two sketches showing the place where they are proposing the new well.

Don Hogan, architect with HDR, explained that there are very few changes, just a few minor things such as a slightly different roof structure. The color board is identical to what they had shown previously. There is a concrete base with a split-face block above that. The roof overhang is the same as that at Well 5. There are a couple of anodized aluminum accents. The landscape has an emphasis on maintaining a natural character. They are trying to keep as many significant trees as possible and had an arborist evaluate the trees. They will take out a couple of large trees, but are actually replanting three trees for every one removed. Since this needs to be a secure site, they are trying to use low ground-covering plants. The back side has the tower that is 30 feet in height and 5 feet in diameter. There will be a gelcoat covering to match the dark green. The back side of the building is almost a mirror image of the front. The structure has a butterfly roof. The building is in character with what is around Avondale, as opposed to Target and others.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Hall:

- Confirmed that the security provisions are the same as those for Well 5.
- Was supportive of the project.

Mr. Meade:

- Confirmed that this tower was different than Well 5 because it was smaller in diameter and less exposed so did not have to be hidden. This tower would be green and should blend into the tree backdrop.
- Thought the buildings were cool.
- Wished they could speed up the process.

Mr. Wobker:

- Had no comments.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Commented about the excessive use of bleeding heart on the landscape plan. That plant is seasonal and disappears at times. She recommended adding another plant such as kinnikinnick that would be there for the other half year.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L060422, SOURCE IMPROVEMENT, WELL NO. 3 PROJECT, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. Sidewalks should be differentiated from the vehicular paths by texturing, color, or use of a different material. This is especially necessary for the sidewalks running along the garage driveways and where pedestrian paths cross vehicular paths.
2. The lighting plan is subject to the approval of the Technical Review Committee. Provide information on site lighting.
3. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies:
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11x17-inch submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.
4. The secondary access shown on the Site Plan would not be used.

MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

APPROVAL

L060429, Microsoft Building 120, Phase 2

Description: Minor modifications to the existing 19,362 square feet office building

Location: 15320 NE 40th Street

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Applicant: Brenda Ross with KDW Architects

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani presented the staff report, explaining that there would be a new addition and some minor changes to an existing building: the installation of mechanical equipment with screening on the southwest corner, some minor changes in the parking lot, and a landscape island in the parking lot. Staff recommendations include mitigating the blank walls, changing all the chain link fencing and gates to solid building materials, and emphasizing the main entrance.

Doug Diel, 10202 5th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98125, commented that there were three issues from the previous design that were concerns: One rooftop mechanical screen and the issue of providing some architectural treatment to the top of that; and the front entry has been changed. He explained that this is a security building for Microsoft that they want to hide in plain sight. They have rearranged the front of the building and put in a new landscape island in front. The concrete has been rearranged and textured in front of the entry. There is a lighter treatment around the entry so that it reads as an entry. They have lined up the generator enclosure so it keeps the same lights with the existing building. The existing building is a glass block put into a split-faced masonry base. They could not match the original masonry because it is no longer made. The base is being reinforced so that in the event of an earthquake it will survive. They have taken windows out of the first floor for security reasons, and the building cannot be rammed into. The ground level equipment screen has been replaced with a solid screen wall that mimics the screen wall that is on the roof. The drawing on L-B-01 has been greatly enhanced from the original application. They have requested to connect NE 40th Street to Building 121 and have created a meandering walk and an area for people to sit. They are not able to landscape on the east or north sides due to requirements for traffic but are putting landscape on the west side. They have changed the trim at the top of the building, the top of the mechanical enclosure, and at the entry. The applicant did not want to put a trellis with plants up the screen wall.

Mark Brumbaugh, landscape architect, 600 N 85th Street #102, Seattle, WA 98103, had the full color landscape drawing and further clarified the landscaping.

Ms. Jeelani requested that the applicant remove Note 27 about having a chain link fence on A-H-02.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Hall:

- Had no issues or questions.

Mr. Meade:

- Thought the packet and explanations were thorough.
- Had no questions or comments.

Mr. Wobker:

- Understood the concern about the blank wall, but this building is different than most buildings. There are a lot of blank walls, but that is Microsoft's goal.
- Thought the proposal was okay as it was presented.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Concurred on this one. To soften the blank wall would probably call more attention to the building. Now that it is a solid wall, there is a little bit of play with the shadows and the big tree holding down that corner.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L060429, MICROSOFT BUILDING 120, PHASE 2, WITH STAFF CONDITIONS:

1. In its previous consultation meeting, the Design Review Board recommended changing all the chain link fencing and gates to solid building materials compatible with the materials used on the building. Please use a solid building material in place of the chain link and get that approved by staff. Note that the reference #27 on A-H-02 that has to do with chain line fence has been resolved with staff.
2. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies:
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11x17-inch submitted

drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement.
MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

APPROVAL

L060434, Riverwalk at Redmond Condominiums

Description: Conversion from apartments to condominiums includes smooth coating stucco, changing stair and deck railings, new garbage enclosure and building carports

Location: 15825 Leary Way NE

Applicant Request: Approval

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

Applicant: Kim Steward with Core Design

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / 425.556.2443

Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report on this project involving five apartment buildings being converted to condominiums. They are changing the stucco, the roof, the windows, and removing some of the railings and fencing. They are using some new colors. She explained that the applicant had brought a materials board and planned to surround the windows with a fake stone window treatment. This would be a better development than it currently is. Staff's issues are the trash enclosures, changing the chain link fencing to another material, the linearity of the buildings, and the monotony of the trims the applicant is using to mitigate all the windows.

Kim Steward, Core Design, 601 Union Street #3232, Seattle, WA 98101, described the finish they are proposing for the stucco, which is a faux finish with a cloudy patina—not a paint or a flat color, but a stucco flexible product that has a range of 15 colors. She showed some areas where it goes light to dark. They are proposing one base color because there is not any real consistent architectural detail between these buildings. She explained that there are four accents on the buildings: the front doors will all be a charcoal that is almost black, wrapped with the architectural stone, the black composition of the roof that is flat with skylights, and other black accents. She noted that the carports were approved long ago but never got built. She proposed one carport per unit except for those in the horseshoe. She described the architectural stone as Patterson Whittaker foam core sand and concrete finish in only five color variations.

Jim Rimshaw, J Architects, provided some of the color renderings for the project, saying he was impressed with the quality of the finishes. Typically, in a multi-family residential complex one would find a palette of materials used over and over again. The materials being provided here are somewhat unique. They are taking what was initially a bland building built in the 1980s and turning it into something much more appealing. The design of the window surround reminded him of a Tuscan theme, and he said he could picture some of the hilltowns in Northern Italy that are usually monochromatic.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Hall:

- Confirmed that the parapets have windows because of vaulted ceilings.
- Supported the design proposal.
- Knew these condo conversions could be difficult, but it appeared to him they were doing something different.
- Supported them introducing a second color, such as ochre or terra cotta, on the area that moves back from the wall—should be a wall color, not a trim color.

Mr. Meade:

- Asked about the drawing for the gazebo, which was not provided by the applicant. (The applicant explained that the gazebo would be on a 10x10-foot pad.)
- Said he was somewhat familiar with the site.
- Was concerned about the monotony of the color scheme. Would recommend that they find another color that is complementary.
- Recommended a lot of landscaping along the edges fairly exposed to the trail.

- Recommended breaking out different buildings with slightly different tones.
- Loved the iron ore color that would be used on the doors.
- Liked the finishes and the treatments.
- Suggested finding a way to have a background piece to the whole building.
- Suggested knocking off the existing stucco coating by sanding it off.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Should have a varied palette of color. Needs a complexity of color to take it to the condo level.

Mr. Wobker:

- Had nothing to say about the architecture and colors.
- Was concerned about the tree removal, especially those along the river trail. (Ms. Johnson explained that the two trees along the river trail are diseased cottonwoods, very brittle and soft, leaning over the trail. There are 89 significant trees on the property, of which the applicant is proposing the removal of nine to be replaced with eleven.)
- Was concerned that the carports' lighting must be screened or shielded as there should be no spillover glare from the site. This could be worked out with staff.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE L060434, RIVERWALK AT REDMOND CONDOMINIUMS, ELEVATIONS, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPE PLAN, AND LIGHTING PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant should work with staff regarding final design on the screening for the trash enclosures. Must use a solid, nontransparent building material for the gate. Applicant can work with staff on this.
2. The design of the gazebo would also be worked out with staff.
3. Replace all significant trees that will be removed at a 1:1 ratio.
4. The lighting plan is subject to the approval of the Technical Review committee. The lighting fixture cut sheets shall be provided by the applicant to the City of Redmond for review.
5. Presentation Materials Inconsistencies
 - a. Where inconsistencies between the floor plans and elevations are found after the Design Review Board has approved this project, the elevations approved by the Design Review Board at this meeting will prevail.
 - b. If, after this Design Review Board approval, there are any inconsistencies found in the information provided for the elevations, floor plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, materials and color between the presentation boards and the 11x17-inch submitted drawings, the Design Review Board and the Redmond Planning Staff will review and determine which design version will be followed for Site Plan Entitlement. What was presented this evening is what will be built.
6. The colors will be presented again to the Design Review Board but not necessarily in a formal presentation. Incorporate an accent color on the building elevations to break the horizontality and monotony.

MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060042, Redmond TOD

Description: Six-story mixed use building to include approximately 300,000 square feet, occupancy 324 units, 15,000 square feet of office space, and 150,000 square-foot parking structure

Location: 161st Avenue NE & NE 83rd Street

Applicant: Tom Eanes with Hewitt Architects

Prior Review Date: 09/21/06

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee presented the staff report for the second pre-application on this project. Staff had some concerns, as follows: Staff needed more information about the locations of the balconies and wants more balconies on the north elevation. At this point, staff was not inclined to recommend approval of the

balcony deviations. Staff was not inclined to recommend approval of a deviation request for courtyard widths. They needed to go to these spaces and feel the width of spaces that are enclosed by buildings that tall. Staff was amenable to considering fewer shrubs and trees in those spaces. Regarding a reduction in parking aisle width, the Technical Committee would not approve this because the residents/patrons might find it difficult to maneuver in the garage. Staff had concerns with the roof design—needed more articulation and modulation, such as a stronger cornice line or additional height. Staff was concerned with the cladding scheme of the building as proposed thus far. Staff was encouraged with the use of brick at the ground level (street fronts); however, it appeared that a majority of the building was proposed to be clad with a “smooth panel” and horizontal lap siding. Staff found that the window patterns and accenting with the horizontal siding features seemed to be too repetitive for this large grouping of buildings. There was not much detailing around the windows, and the small horizontal windows on the 2nd-4th floors (street fronts) were reminiscent of prison windows. In general, staff found the architectural style somewhat oppressive, sterile, and introverted, especially the north elevation, which had very few balconies and the east elevation, which was very long and repetitive. The building was also lacking in terms of tripartite articulation. Because the building is so tall and broad, the ground floor (base) seemed to be squashed. The ground floor ceiling height could be raised to make the base stronger and more prominent. The roof line needed more work to create a stronger top to the building. The middle of the building needed additional design features or accenting to break up the monotony of the rhythm created by the vertical elements. The parking garage openings on the south and west sides would be visible from the walking paths adjoining them. These openings should include some type of artwork or ornamental metal work in conjunction with the security grating. The exterior walls of these garage faces should be clad with a smooth plaster/cement finish, brick or masonry. Staff believes this building will be an icon and was not currently comfortable with its general design.

David Hewitt, 119 Pine Street Suite 400, Seattle, WA 98101, responded that they are interested in creating a focal element and letting it relate well to the street, not in terms of themes, but in honesty and authenticity. They listened very carefully to staff and decided how to respond to staff's concerns. They responded to the idea that the building needs to have a sense of transparency and a connection to the street. He described the site plan, noting the major façade along 161st Avenue NE and the one across from the transportation center. There are two entrances on the various levels at the edge, which is better than breaking the façade along the street. He described the architectural elements. In addition to the breaks in the façade provided by the mid-block connector and the monumental stair, an additional recess has been added, as suggested by the Board, aligned with the terrace in Building A above. This breaks up the commercial frontage along NE 83rd Street into three similarly-sized major pieces corresponding to the massing of the residential buildings above. The recesses at the mid-block connector, the monumental stair, and the terrace above have been stepped back from the main building line with planters, forming a layering effect horizontally from the sidewalk back into the spaces. As suggested by the Board, the main vertical elements of the façade in the residential levels have been aligned with the piers in the commercial frontage. The applicant was asking for one more story than is allowed in this zone. There is no height limit at this time. The base height is 15 feet, and there is brick masonry on the lower levels of the building. They have tried to bring in more transparency. They have suggested balconies above the canopy of the first floor to bring the base up some. He showed the elevation facing the parking garage in perspective and in flat elevation. He also showed the proposed colors and materials.

Mark Brumbaugh, landscape architect, 600 N. 85th Street #102, Seattle, WA 98103, presented the landscape plan, noting this is an important space being on a mid-block connector. They propose a meandering pathway with a series of nodes and a seat wall within the 30-foot space between this building and the parking structure. They plan to berm up the landscape against the buildings on either side of the pathway and have pavers to give a patio feel. They may use porous concrete for the pathway surface. This will be a fairly shady space with buildings on each side. They want some tall vertical elements in there. There will be Swedish quaking aspen in clusters to screen the garages, ornamental grasses, ferns, camellias, and seasonal plants. There will be Boston ivy against the structures. They plan to give some three-dimensional character to the nodes.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Hall:

- Confirmed that the applicant is planning for a rental residential project at this time.
- Liked the look of the project.
- Was not opposed to having additional height in the center.
- Commented that providing some variety to the windows was surprising to him, but could add some windows that go down closer to the floor level.
- Thought it seemed like a landmark building; would not be surprised if they ended up with units for sale rather than rent.
- Commented that this is more a Seattle-scale building to create urban fabric.
- Liked the landscaping plan.
- Hoped people would walk through the pedestrian areas.
- Was supportive of what was presented.

Mr. Meade:

- Found the tripartite element to be very striking.
- Was very supportive of the way they have broken down the mass with the tripartite accent.
- Thought that pushing up the top on the west elevation was good. The lighting for the top story units would be extraordinary.
- Liked the introduction of the street to create rhythm and embrace the main pedestrian way to the top of the podium.
- Was ready to see this come in for approval.

Mr. Wobker:

- Thought the average resident of Redmond would not be excited about the tradeoff; this site was more interesting as a pedestrian area than a parking lot.
- Would make a much more congested area.
- Thought the people waiting for a bus would perceive this as a six-story building; the height would cause shade.
- Commented that having 324 units would not be a plus for the people in Redmond.
- Said he totally supported the staff's hesitations on allowing these kinds of design flexibility requests.
- Commented that the average person living in Redmond would not see this building as a plus.
- Commented that the materials are going to be top notch.
- Said that Fraser Court across the street from this site was done in a way that a building should not be done.
- Wanted rich materials; has to be sophisticated whether condos or apartments.
- Wanted to know if there would be a tot lot and if there would be a place for a school bus to stop.
- Inquired if there was a place set aside for moving trucks that are in a bike lane.
- Was a little concerned about the fire lane going down the easement; depends on whose land it is. If public property, it irritated him that it was being used as a fire lane.
- Thought the people of Redmond would need something quality at this location because this development is going to be very visible. Otherwise, they will not think this is a good tradeoff.
- Commented that if the project was not as good as Lionsgate, then it was not good enough.
- Thought it grand to see the brick there.

Mr. Cope (e-mailed comments read into the record):

- Continued to strongly support the direction of the project. Thought the Hewitt firm was maximizing the potential of what the project should be.
- Thought the pedestrian walk much improved, but still did not reach the mark. He wanted to be clearer in order to direct the design team, but could not be. Felt this was competent and okay, but was hoping and continued to request more than okay. Thought the applicant's presentation might clarify what he was seeing with the plans in-hand.

- Understood staff's point about the courtyard dimensions, but thought he could be okay with the approach that Hewitt is taking. If the courtyard could be wider, it should be; but if not, he could support the design.
- Thought strongly that sustainability and administrative design flexibility must be linked. The drawings gave him no indication that his previous plea about sustainability and "green" has taken root. He saw no discussion about it nor did he see anything in the design. He would tie any "flexibilities" to green design attributes. But even without the request for "flexibilities," he would like the Board to require a reporting of steps taken in the design relative to green design. Whether the answer is "nothing, something, or a lot," he would to know which it is. This project is large and significant. Since located on a high-image site, he thought Redmond could expect to know what the applicant is going to do about sustainable design considerations.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Supported the raising of the roof line.
- Thought there was an opportunity for the lobby to spill out into the courtyard by Building A.
- Liked the idea of adding some windows on the end (where the prison windows are). Thought it interesting to have high windows, but they need to be softened some.
- Supported the exploration of color for the color options.

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, said that staff would spend some time with the applicant in the next week or so working on another iteration. Sustainability needs to be addressed. There needs to be more variety in the windows and more detail. The height with the variation at the tops of the building looked like it was going in the direction the Board wanted it to go.

Mr. Brumbaugh inquired if it would be appropriate for the applicant to send some drawings that were not included in the packet to Mr. Cope.

Mr. Black responded that it would be appropriate for the applicant to meet with staff and the DRB in preparing the next design iteration.

Mr. Hewitt added that they have been working with Metro on the aesthetics of the project.

(Robert Hall left the meeting at 10:08 p.m.)

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060039, Redmond Transit Parking Garage

Description: Three-level parking garage consisting of 108,000 square feet, one ground level, two elevated levels containing approximately 150 parking stalls. Designed to the draft Downtown District Design Standard and 2003 IBC

Location: NE 85th Street and 161st Avenue NE

Applicant: Gerrie Jackson with King County Metro

Prior Review Dates: 08/17/06 & 09/21/06

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He reported that the mid-block pathway is on the TOD property, and they would be installing the landscaping, including the climbing vines. He commented that he did not see anything that troubled him on this project. Staff wants the colors to go with what is happening next door when they are presented. He reiterated the main issues raised by the Board at the last pre-application: the architecture of the garage should utilize similar forms and materials that are proposed for the TOD project next door; the rooftop parking level should have some screening elements to break up the view of the parking field from units above; berming and landscaping along the west side of the garage (within the mid-block) pedestrian way would greatly help to soften this area; the ground floor (front) elevation should include some type of storefront use or activity. Staff thought the applicant was going in the right direction by picking up cues from the TOD building.

Paul Fuesel, 753 9th Avenue N, Seattle, WA 98109, was present for the applicant. They are trying to be a good neighbor to the TOD and have met with the TOD team several times to see how the two projects could be married together. They need to balance the features of the appearance of the facades.

Greg Harry, 753 9th Avenue N, Seattle, WA 98109, architect for the project, explained that the project has evolved in a positive way and has benefited from the DRB's input. The purpose is to concentrate all the surface parking into a parking garage. He showed a diagram that gave some idea of the color palette already going on there, noting that the garage has to read as a part of the entire transit facility. The 30-foot walkway needed to be designed to consider both projects, and one of the objectives was to minimize the impact of the garage as viewed from the transit center, so berming up against the garage to reduce that façade and screening vertically with tall columnar aspen trees. The vertical screen would project 8 feet above the building to provide a visual screen. They have received a special dispensation from Metro to allow plant materials to climb up that metal screen. They raised the canopy on the north elevation and made it linear. They will use brick on the project as a wayfinding element in the stairway tower. They have created something that resembles a storefront display space that would be illuminated. For screening of the roof deck parking above, on the west elevation the screening element projects vertically as opposed to horizontally. Trellises have been targeted for those facades that have the potential to be viewed from the TOD side. They have established a trellis element that will step down with the ramp. They could use taller trees for screening but that would block the views from the units. For the lighting on the top of the garage, they have vertically oriented lighting that will not be obstructed by the screen elements. They are using a warmer brick, and the canopies are the darker green METRO canopies. The green screen is the same green. The materials are quality materials and will need to be sturdy to withstand vandalism. They are incorporating a similar ribbed panel that is used on the TOD that would be contained within the concrete columns, which will be solid up to 42 inches to contain the headlights. The southeast corner of the upper garage will have a service element that will be screened by cladding. The vegetation that the TOD plants will be what grows up here and can grow up each one of the screens on the west elevation. The planting could be Boston ivy or clematis.

Judd Black, Development Review Manager, commented that a staff concern is that the screen is nearly invisible.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Wobker:

- Appreciated the existing trees being left at the back of the building.
- Thought the design looked like the parking structure in Redmond Town Center across from the Lake Washington School District building.
- Appeared to him to be more than the City parking structure.
- Noted the need to put some good signage in front of the structure indicating it is a Park 'N Ride. Would like to see a protruding blade sign.
- Would not mind seeing a neon sign if he lived across from it.
- Was concerned about where the people park their bikes in the cocoons. There will be six across the street next to Phase I restroom for the drivers, but not on the street. There should be a discussion between the City and METRO on the color and type.

Mr. Meade:

- Thanked the applicant for the responses to the DRB comments.
- Thought they were heading in the right direction on the mid-block walkway.
- Was not satisfied with the north elevation, but was satisfied on the other three. Wanted to see some of the vertical modulation and massing at the TOD to try to integrate this parking garage. Wanted this to look like an upward-winged parking garage. Thought more could be done.
- Was pleased with the concept of the display window in lieu of retail space.
- Suggested that they try to replicate the three matching masses on the north elevation of the TOD building, although not exactly, to create that kind of rhythm. Try to figure out a way to create massing that steps vertically and in the cross direction back if it would work to modulate that direction.

- Thought it did not appear that the upper areas are totally recessive. The screening might be fighting it. (Mr. Black suggested extending the columns up to the second floor to add some richness on that elevation.)
- Suggested a trellis to continue the column rhythm. (The applicant wanted to be sure there was no suggestion that there is a people space up there.) (Mr. Black suggested finding a way to disappear that second space opening that indicates this could not be anything other than a garage; need to camouflage a little.)

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Commented that for the brick columns and along the base of the windows there is a base, but the drawing shows the brick walls going right down to the ground without an apparent base. (Mr. Harry said that the applicant wants to relate to the comfort stations.) She thought it would be better to relate to the TOD than the comfort station. There needs to be a base there.
- Thought the project was moving in the right direction.
- Liked the berms and that the plants are allowed to go up the garage.
- Liked that notch in the corner that opens up that pedestrian walkway.
- Thought that staff had a point with the trellis; the applicant should take one more look at what is going on at the top of the garage for maybe there is a way to move the trellises around so there is more of a rhythm and more whimsy. The trellis down the middle helps, but the TOD still looks down on a sea of cars.

Mr. Black summarized that the gap on the north elevation is a problem, so the applicant should put together two or three alternatives for staff to review and then send to the DRB members. If they could get consensus, then they are ready to submit a site plan development application.

Mr. Fischer explained that for the site plan development application the applicant should have something ready to propose for the north elevation display window's information box depth, which should be 18-24 inches to make room for vegetation on one side and cars on the other. The applicant should provide some brainstorming ideas on how the information box could be used. Examples in Redmond that work are: Macy's and Eddie Bauer; one that does not is Bed, Bath & Beyond.

Mr. Harry clarified that the tower on the south façade would be clad with vertically-oriented box rib cladding.

ADJOURNMENT

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO ADJOURN AT 11:15 PM.
MOTION CARRIED (3-0).**

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY